

JUL 31 1935

To: *Library, L. M. A. L.*

AUG 8 1935

TECHNICAL NOTES

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

No. 535

THE EFFECT OF DEPTH OF STEP ON THE WATER PERFORMANCE
OF A FLYING-BOAT HULL MODEL

N.A.C.A. MODEL 11-G

By Joe W. Bell
Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory

Presented to
the Dept. of the Langley
Memorial Aeronautical
Laboratory

Washington
July 1935

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

TECHNICAL NOTE NO. 535

THE EFFECT OF DEPTH OF STEP ON THE WATER PERFORMANCE
OF A FLYING-BOAT HULL MODEL

N.A.C.A. MODEL 11-C

By Joe W. Bell

SUMMARY

N.A.C.A. model 11-C was tested in the N.A.C.A. tank with four different depths of step to obtain information as to the effect of the depth of step on the water performance. The depths of step were selected to cover the practicable range of depths and in each case the included angle between the forebody and afterbody keels was kept the same, $6-1/2^\circ$.

Small depths of step were found to give lower resistance at speeds below and at the hump speed of the model and greater depths of step lower resistance at high speeds. For low resistance throughout the speed range of the model investigated the most desirable depth of step is from 2.5 to 4.0 percent of the beam. The change of the best trim angle τ_0 caused by variation of the depth of step was not appreciable. Increased depths of step caused increases in the maximum positive trimming moments at all trim angles investigated.

INTRODUCTION

A seaplane hull must serve as both a displacement and a planing boat. As a displacement boat it must have the center of buoyancy near the longitudinal position of the center of gravity of the seaplane; as a planing boat it must have the center of pressure of the planing surface near the center of gravity. Satisfactory performance cannot be obtained from a hull composed of one planing surface because the center of pressure of the surface approaches the stern as the wetted length decreases at high

speeds and light loads. A seaplane hull should therefore consist of two or more planing surfaces separated by a step or steps.

The single-step type of hull was selected for the present investigation because it is a type widely used in American practice. In this type of hull the step is located a short distance abaft the center of gravity of the seaplane and the afterbody keel rises several degrees above the forebody keel projected.

For the purpose of discussing the action of the step, the take-off run of a seaplane can be divided into three stages: first, acting as a displacement boat at low speeds; second, acting as two planing surfaces in the earlier stages of planing; and third, acting as a single planing surface at speeds near get-away. During the displacement stage a deep step increases turbulence, which adds to the resistance. In the second, or "two-planing-surface" stage, the afterbody acts as an additional planing surface in the disturbed wake of the forebody. The problem of depth of step becomes complex at this speed since it is desirable to have the afterbody planing at a favorable attitude. In the third stage of the take-off run, when the lift of the afterbody has become negligible and the forebody or main planing surface of the hull is carrying the load, it is desirable to have either the afterbody clear of the water or a minimum area of the afterbody surface touching the water. This condition can be accomplished by a deep step or a large angle of afterbody keel.

The present investigation consists of tank tests of a model of a flying-boat hull with the depth of step varied to cover the practicable range of depths of the step. All other dimensions of the model were kept at constant values during the series of tests. A further test program including a number of combinations of depth of step and angle of afterbody keel will be started in the near future.

Although the effect of the depth of step is dependent upon the angle of afterbody keel, the length of the afterbody, and a number of other variables, the present investigation should be helpful in showing the effect of depth of step on this particular type of hull.

APPARATUS AND METHODS

The N.A.C.A. tank and associated equipment are discussed in detail in reference 1. The apparatus used in making the present tests was as described except for the change in the method of suspending the towing gear discussed in reference 2.

The present tests were made by the general method discussed in reference 1. The procedure in this case is to tow the model at a series of loads, speeds, and trim angles selected to include the more important combinations of these variables. The resistance, trimming moment, and draft at the step are measured for each test point.

DESCRIPTION OF MODELS

Model 11-C, which has been described in reference 3, was used as the parent model of the series investigated. Model 11-C is a model of a flying-boat hull whose depth of step and other proportions, in general, conform closely to current American practice.

The model was made in two pieces bolted together at the step. It was altered to form the three additional models for this series by moving the afterbody vertically with respect to the forebody. The small discontinuity formed in the deck when making this change was faired in with plasticine to reduce any possible windage effect. The principal lines of the model and the method of changing the depth of the step are shown in figure 1.

The designations of the models of the series were as follows:

Model	Depth of step, inch	Depth of step, percent boom
11-C-11	1/8	0.74
11-C-12	5/16	1.84
11-C	9/16	3.31
11-C-13	1	5.88

RESULTS

Test data.— The resistance, speed, trim angle, and trimming moment for each test point were determined directly from the test data by deducting the usual tare. Curves of resistance and trimming moment for each load condition plotted against speed at each trim angle investigated are shown for the four models tested in figures 2 to 25.

Nondimensional results.— The number of variables involved in the test data make the comparison of models or the application of test data to design difficult. The method used for reducing the number of variables is discussed in reference 4. The procedure consists of determining the minimum resistance and best trim angle for each speed and load by plotting resistance against trim angle at each of a series of representative speeds with load on the water as the parameter. Curves of minimum resistance for each speed are then plotted against load. The results are plotted as curves of resistance coefficient at best trim angle against speed coefficient, with load coefficient as the parameter.

The nondimensional coefficients are defined as follows:

Load coefficient $C_{\Delta} = \frac{\Delta}{wb^3}$

Resistance coefficient $C_R = \frac{R}{wb^3}$

Speed coefficient $C_V = \frac{V}{\sqrt{gb}}$

Trimming-moment coefficient $C_M = \frac{M}{wb^4}$

where Δ is the load on the water, lb.

R , resistance, lb.

M , trimming moment, lb./ft.

w , specific weight of water, lb./cu.ft.

b , beam of the hull, ft.

V, speed, ft./sec.

g, acceleration of gravity, ft./sec.

Note: $w = 63.5$ lb./cu.ft. for water in the N.A.C.A. tank at the time of making the tests.

The nondimensional resistance data are given in figures 26, 27, 28, and 29 for models 11-C-11, 11-C-12, 11-C, and 11-C-13, respectively.

Precision.— The test results shown in the faired curves are believed to be accurate within the following limits:

Load on the water	± 0.3 lb.
Resistance	± 0.2 lb.
Speed	± 0.1 ft./sec.
Trim angle	$\pm 0.1^\circ$
Trimming moment	± 1 lb. ft.

DISCUSSION

The effect of the depth of step on the load-resistance ratio of the model at four representative speeds is shown in figure 30. In the family of curves corresponding to speed coefficient of 2.0 it may be seen that the shallow step gives the highest Δ/R and that each increase of depth of step causes a reduction in the Δ/R . The curves corresponding to hump speed show the same trend but do not show as great a change in Δ/R as the curves for a speed coefficient of 2.0. This variance may be explained in part by the fact that the action of the model at hump speed is a combination of displacement and planing and that the step is not causing as much turbulence as at the lower speed.

At a speed coefficient of 4.5, the model is planing and the effect of the step has changed from increasing the resistance to decreasing the resistance. It will be noted that the deeper steps give higher values of Δ/R at this speed. The complete reversal of the order of the curves

has been brought about by the change in the action of the step. At the speed coefficient of 6.0, corresponding to a speed near get-away for possible applications of this hull, the curves for various depths of step have retained the same order as at the 4.5 speed coefficient but show a greater change in Δ/R than at the lower speed. At this high speed the advantage of the deeper step lies in the fact that it keeps more of the afterbody clear of the water.

In figure 31 the load-resistance ratio at representative speeds is plotted against the depth of step with the load on the water as the parameter. It will be noted that a minimum depth of step is desirable at and below hump speed; whereas the most desirable depth of step is about 6 percent of the beam at higher speeds. A depth of step of about 4 percent of the beam is sufficient to keep the afterbody clear of the water at high speeds, therefore a deeper step would only increase the clearance of the afterbody and cause no change in the high-speed resistance. When all speeds are considered, the depth of step that gives the highest average Δ/R seems to lie between 2.5 and 4.0 percent of the beam.

A comparison of the Δ/R of the four depths of step considered for approximate take-off conditions of a possible application is given graphically in figure 32. The load on the water for this comparison was approximated by assuming the wing lift to vary as the square of the speed without making allowance for changes of the angle of attack. This figure indicates that the model having a depth of step of 3.31 percent of the beam will take off in less time and distance than any of the three other models investigated.

Figure 33 shows the effect of the depth of step on the best trim angle at hump speed and at a speed near the get-away speed of possible applications. The best trim angle increases slightly with the depth of step but this difference in best trim angle is not great at any speed.

The effect of the depth of step on the trimming moments of the model is shown in figure 34 by curves of maximum positive trimming-moment coefficient plotted against load coefficient for each depth of step at four trim angles. It is noted that moments increase in the positive direction as the depth of step is increased.

CONCLUSIONS

Quantitative predictions cannot be made from this investigation because of the number of variables influencing the effect of the depth of step. The following conclusions, however, are thought to be true for models of the type investigated.

1. The depth of step of a seaplane hull does not have a critical value but can be varied through a limited range without a great effect on performance. This range was from 2.5 to 4.0 percent of the beam for the model tested.

2. At speeds below and at the hump speed a small depth of step is desirable for low resistance.

3. At high speeds, the water resistance decreases as the depth of step is increased up to a certain depth beyond which no further reduction is obtained. This depth is about 6 percent of the beam for the model investigated in the present program.

4. The depth of step may be fixed arbitrarily to reduce the resistance of a hull at the speed where the most difficulty is encountered.

5. Reduction of depth of step can be considered as a possible method for reducing air drag in flight at the expense of water performance.

Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory,
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics,
Langley Field, Va., June 7, 1935.

REFERENCES

1. Truscott, Starr: The N.A.C.A. Tank. A High-Speed Towing Basin for Testing Models of Seaplane Floats. T.R. No. 470, N.A.C.A., 1933.
2. Shoemaker, James M.: Tank Tests of Flat and V-Bottom Planing Surfaces. T.N. No. 509, N.A.C.A., 1934.
3. Dawson, John R.: A General Tank Test of N.A.C.A. Model 11-C Flying-Boat Hull, Including the Effect of Changing the Plan Form of the Step. T.N. No. 538, N.A.C.A., 1935.
4. Shoemaker, James M., and Parkinson, John B.: A Complete Tank Test of a Model of a Flying-Boat Hull - N.A.C.A. Model No. 11. T.N. No. 464, N.A.C.A., 1933.

Fig. 1






Figure 1.-Model 11-C showing method of changing depth of step.

Figure 2.-Resistance and trimming moment, $\tau = 2^\circ$. Model 11-C-11.

Figure 3.-Resistance and trimming moment, $\tau = 3^\circ$, Model 11-0-11.




Figure 4.-Resistance and trimming moment, $\tau = 5^\circ$. Model 11-0-11.






Figure 5.-Resistance and trimming moment, $\tau = 70^\circ$. Model 11-C-11.



Figure 7.-Resistance and trimming moment, $\tau = 11^\circ$. Model 11-C-11.




Figure 8.--Resistance and trimming moment, $\tau = 2^\circ$. Model 11-C-12.




Figure 9.-Resistance and trimming moment, $\alpha = 3^\circ$. Model 11-O-12.

Fig. 10

N.A.C.A. Technical Note No. 535




Figure 10.-Resistance and trimming moment, $T=5^\circ$. Model 11-C-12.




Figure 11.-Resistance and trimming moment, $\tau = 70^\circ$, Model 11-Q-12.





Figure 12.-Resistance and trimming moment, $\gamma=9^\circ$. Model 11-G-12.

Figure 13.-Resistance and trimming moment, $\tau = 11^\circ$. Model 11-C-12.




Figure 14.-Resistance and trimming moment, $\tau = 20^\circ$. Model 11-C.




Figure 15.-Resistance and trimming moment, $\tau = 5^\circ$. Model 11-G.




Figure 15.-Resistance and trimming moment, $\tau = 5^\circ$. Model 11-0.




Figure 17a.-Resistance.

$\tau = 7^\circ$. Model 11-C.




Figure 17b.-Trimming moment.

$\gamma = 7^\circ$. Model 11-C.




Figure 18a.—Resistance.

$\tau = 9^\circ$. Model 11-C.







Figure 18b.—Trimming moment.

$\tau = 9^\circ$. Model 11-C.

Figure 19.-Resistance and trimming moment, $\tau = 11^\circ$. Model 11-C.

Figure 20.-Resistance and trimming moment, $\tau = 2^\circ$. Model 11-C-13.






Figure 22.-Resistance and trimming moment, $\tau = 5^\circ$, Model 11-0-13.






Figure 23.-Resistance and trimming moment, $r = 7^\circ$, Model 11-C-13.

Figure 24.-Resistance and trimming moment, $\tau=9^\circ$. Model 11-C-13.

Figure 25.-Resistance and trimming moment, $\tau = 11^\circ$. Model 11-C-13.




Figure 26.-Variation of C_R with C_V at best trim angles. Model 11-C-11.




Figure 27.--Variation of C_R with C_V at best trim angles. Model 11-C-12.





Figure 28.-Variation of C_R with C_V at Best trim angles. Model 11-C.

Figure 29.--Variation of C_R with C_V at best trim angles. Model 11-C-13.




Figure 30.—The effect of depth of step on load/resistance at four representative speeds.







Figure 31a.—Variation of Δ/R with depth of step.



Figures 31b, 31c.—Variation of Δ/R with depth of step.



Figure 33.—Effect of step depth on best trim angle, τ .




Figure 34.—Effect of depth of step on maximum trimming moment in the positive direction.